

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEWIS D. CAMPBELL, OF OHIO,

ON THE

GARDINER AND GALPHIN CLAIMS—VINDICATION OF SECRETARY CORWIN—
THE TREASURY PLUNDERED BY DEMOCRATS WHEN IN POWER—
JUSTIFICATION AND DEFENCE OF GENERAL SCOTT'S
POLITICAL PRINCIPLES,

AND

IN REPLY TO HIS COLLEAGUE HON. EDSON B. OLDS, AND OTHERS.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 12, 1852.

WASHINGTON:

PRINTED AT THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE OFFICE.

1852.



THE PRESIDENCY, &c.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is not my purpose to speak upon the bill before the committee, but in part to reply to the remarks of my colleague from the Circleville district, [Mr. OLDS.] He was in his seat a few minutes since, but I notice is now absent. I would much prefer to have him present, and, as it has been suggested that we should hold an evening session, if that is the pleasure of the committee, I will submit a motion that we take a recess until six o'clock.

Several MEMBERS. "No, no!" "Don't rise!" "Let some other member have the floor!"

Mr. CAMPBELL. I see the committee are not disposed to take a recess now, and I withdraw the motion. If I yield the floor, I may not get it again during the session. I will therefore proceed, as my colleague, if he does not come in, can read my remarks when printed, if he chooses, and digest them, at his leisure.

Mr. Chairman, the first duty the American Representative owes to his constituent, of whatever party, is to defend his character from unjust and false imputations. It is in discharge of such a duty, in part, that I ask the indulgence of the House at this late period of the session. The magnanimous spectacle presented in the early part of the session, by the Representatives from the State of Virginia, challenged my admiration. It will be remembered that a charge was preferred against the Secretary of the Interior—not one that in any way involved his integrity as a public functionary, or the purity of his character as a citizen—but simply the propriety of the manner in which the estimates for his Department had been presented to this House. At the first dawning of an assault, every Virginian in this Hall, discarding mere party feeling, sprang to the floor, ready and eager to defend a son of the "Old Dominion," though a political opponent. Their conduct on that occasion was generous and just—a creditable display of Virginia State pride, gallantry, and magnanimity. In bearing testimony of this honor-

able course on the part of Representatives from a sister State, it is with feelings of the deepest humiliation and regret, that I am forced by a sense of duty to contrast with it the continued efforts of a Representative from that State which gave me birth, and which in part I represent, to blacken the fair fame of one of Ohio's purest and noblest sons, for the paltry purpose of mere party gain. For the credit of my State—for the honor of her citizens of all parties—I had hoped, that if, in the heat of party conflict, it became necessary to have any person to do the work of dishonorable warfare, there would be no one amongst my colleagues, on either side of the Hall, willing to accept the place. I acknowledge my disappointment with deep, deep mortification.

Mr. Chairman, assaults have been made—not once, but often—not in this Hall alone, but elsewhere—by my colleague, [Mr. OLDS,] upon the character of Thomas Corwin, the present Secretary of the Treasury,—a man who has been recognized throughout Ohio, by all parties, through all the embittered political controversies in which he has been a prominent actor, as distinguished for his high moral virtues, and for an integrity not only unquestioned, but unquestionable. And, sir, if I exhibit on this occasion, any unusual warmth of feeling, I may be pardoned for saying in excuse of it, that I was born in the same county in which he has always resided, since, at the age of four years, he was brought from Kentucky, his native State; and that from my boyhood to the present hour, I have found in him, in prosperity and in adversity, all the elements of an honest man, as well as a true, tried, and steadfast friend. Besides, sir, I know that the people I represent, surrounding the home of the Secretary, without party distinction, bear testimony of his inflexible integrity, and will regard the assault which has been thus wantonly made upon him, as one which I could not neglect to repel here, without dishonor and disgrace.

Before proceeding to consider his connection with the "Gardiner claim," upon which the most serious charge is founded, I must advert to the

fact that my colleague never makes a speech in which he does not attempt to excite odium against Mr. Corwin, by dragging in the expression of "bloody hands and hospitable graves!" He displays in this way nothing but the effort of a demagogue to poison the minds of the less-informed portion of the community against a distinguished man of his own State, by a gross perversion of a most patriotic sentiment. Mr. Corwin, during the progress of the war with Mexico, was a member of the United States Senate—a place which he filled with honor to himself, and credit to his country. He was opposed to a war of conquest, and believed with Senator Benton, then, if not now, a leader of the Democratic party, that that war was not just, and that its object was the conquest of a territory, the acquisition of which would be fraught with imminent dangers to the perpetuity of our Union. He spoke against it in the Senate with a power which electrified the whole land, and brought forth the plaudits of his political adversaries. Even Mr. Ritchie, the editor of the Union, on the succeeding day pronounced it through his press, one of the most powerful efforts of the times. His effort, I may say, commanded the admiration of the civilized world, by the bold and eloquent manner in which great moral truths were proclaimed; and that speech, sir, will live in history when the insignificance of its author's calumniators shall have been buried in oblivion. I have it in my hand. I desire that the country, at least that portion of it into whose hands my remarks may, perchance, fall, shall be reminded of the true sentiment expressed, that they may appreciate its merits, and form an enlightened opinion. As to my colleague, although he may have the head, I doubt if he has the heart to appreciate the sentiment, or do justice to the statesman who uttered it. I read the extract:

"What is the territory, Mr. President, which you propose to wrest from Mexico? It is consecrated to the heart of the Mexican by many a well-fought battle with his old Castilian master. His Bunker Hills and Saratogas and Yorktowns, are there! The Mexican can say, 'There I bled for liberty! and shall I surrender that consecrated home of my affections to the Anglo-Saxon invaders? What do they want with it? They have Texas already. They have possessed themselves of the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande. What else do they want? To what shall I point my children as memorials of that independence, which I bequeath to them, when those battle-fields shall have passed from my possession?'"

"Sir, had one come and demanded Bunker Hill of the people of Massachusetts, had England's Lion ever shown himself there, is there a man over thirteen and under ninety, who would not have been ready to meet him—is there a river on this continent that would not have run red with blood—is there a field but would have been piled high with the unburied bones of slaughtered Americans before these consecrated battle-fields of liberty should have been wrested from us? If I were a Mexican I would tell you, 'Have you not room in your own country to bury your dead men? If you come into mine, we will greet you with bloody hands, and welcome you to hospitable graves.'"

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is not a man who has the true feeling of patriotism in his heart who will not readily indorse this sentiment. It may be true, sir—I admit it to be true—that the time for its expression in a rhetorical figure was unfortunate, particularly unfortunate to the orator himself. But no man who loves his country can hesitate to approve the sentiment which my colleague has so often attempted to pervert for the purposes of mere party gain.

THE GARDINER CLAIM.

The connection of Mr. Corwin with the Gard-

iner claim is a theme upon which my colleague loves to dwell. He presumes there is something in that from which he may manufacture a vote in his next Congressional election. Two or three months ago he alluded to it in a speech, when I demanded to know whether he meant to insinuate that the connection of Mr. Corwin with that claim was in any way dishonest or disreputable. His reply was, that he did not so insinuate—leaving upon my mind a satisfactory impression; but upon the minds of other members, as I since learn, the idea that, instead of *insinuating*, he made the *direct charge*.

Time passed on, and I was loth to drag the matter again before the House. A few weeks since ill health drove the Secretary to a visit to his home in Ohio. He had been absent but a few hours from the city before my colleague, pursuing him as it were with the spirit of the hyena, presented a resolution asking a committee of investigation, prefaced with a string of preambles setting forth what rumor (which, I presume, he had himself created in part) said upon the subject. The honorable gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] objected to its introduction, on the ground that no man should be put on his trial upon mere rumor. That preamble betrays a desire on the part of my colleague to involve me in a controversy with him; for he sets out that I, the "immediate representative" of Mr. Corwin, have failed to call for investigation. If it is controversy with me that my colleague has been seeking, I can say to him that he can have it to his heart's content. I called for no investigation because I found no responsible indorser of the charge. And here let me say, that if the calumny was to circulate only where my colleague is personally known, or where Mr. Corwin is personally known, I should not consume a moment of the time of the House. In such case it would fall perfectly harmless. But, sir, I understand that the Democratic Executive Committee, who are directing the movements of the party in this presidential campaign, are circulating the slander, at the rate of one hundred thousand copies, throughout the breadth and length of this great Confederacy; and in this way it will penetrate regions where neither the malicious spirit of my colleague nor the purity of Mr. Corwin's character is known.

A brief statement of the true history of Mr. Corwin's connection with this claim will be sufficient for the present. By the provisions of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, our Government stipulated to pay, for property destroyed during the war with Mexico, a sum not to exceed three millions and a quarter of dollars. A Board of three Commissioners was provided for, who were to examine and report upon all such claims. This man Gardiner presented a claim. General Thompson, of South Carolina, was employed as his counsel. General Thompson being the warm personal friend of Mr. Corwin, and acquainted with his high legal attainments, and desirous to avail himself of his assistance, employed him to aid in the argument to the Board of Commissioners. The fee agreed on to be paid Mr. Corwin by General Thompson was five per cent. upon the amount allowed. Gardiner had nothing to do with Mr. Corwin in this contract. Mr. Corwin spent, to my knowledge, the greater part of one vacation between two sessions of the Senate in the

preparation of arguments in this cause. The proofs were furnished by Gardiner and his agents, and I have the authority of the members of the Board of Commissioners, composed, as it was, of distinguished men and able jurists, for saying that there was no clearer case presented to that Board than this of Gardiner. The papers were most perfect, both in matter of form and substance, and contained internal evidence, by a combination of corroborative circumstances, to force the conclusion that the claim was just. It was allowed.

Now, sir, it is charged that this claim was fraudulent, and the testimony perjured. It may be so, and it may not. Gardiner has been arrested, and because of that, members of Congress who may desire fat offices, think to make progress in their pursuit by jumping at the conclusion of his guilt before a trial. I do not deny his guilt, yet any man who will assert it, in high or low places, to his prejudice, before a fair trial, (though he be in irons,) does not deserve the rights of an American citizen. If guilty, he has acted strangely. He had received payment of his claim, or a large portion of it. Leaving his money here, he went to Europe. There hearing that it was rumored here this claim was fraudulent, with all possible speed, he returned to this country to meet his accusers, and gave himself up to the law. Though he may be guilty, this conduct, sir, is very like that of one conscious of his innocence.

My colleague sometimes places his condemnation of Mr. Corwin upon the ground, that when in the Senate, at eight dollars per day, he had no right to engage in this pursuit of his profession. In reply to that, I will only say, that although Mr. Corwin did not consume as much of the time of the Senate in speaking as his friends desired, nevertheless, the record will show him to have been present on all occasions when voting, the most essential part of legislation, was done. My colleague, who, when a candidate two years ago, ran home to electioneer the best part of a month before the adjournment, thereby dodging or evading a vote upon that test question of the day—the fugitive slave law; who “Galphinized” upon the public Treasury (in a small way) to the amount of about one hundred and fifty dollars for per diem up to the close of the session, whilst he was at home making stump speeches, averring his tenacity to free soil principles, should be the last man to raise such frivolous objections.

But, Mr. Chairman, to the Gardiner claim. It will long be remembered by the members of the Thirty-first Congress, that, whilst we were engaged in this Hall in the controversy about the connection of Secretary Crawford with the Galphin claim, we were startled by the announcement that President Taylor was dying. The House adjourned. In a few days Mr. Corwin was invited to take charge of the Treasury Department. I had the pleasure then, as I had had during the whole of that session, of living with him. Our relations were then, as they ever have been, of the most intimate and confidential character. For political reasons, I was opposed, warily opposed to his going into that Cabinet; hence every movement affecting his action made an impression on my memory. Mr. Corwin, having then fresh upon his mind the scenes of this House a few days previous upon the Galphin matter, declared to his friends that his contingent fees on Mexican claims

were an insuperable barrier to his acceptance; that under no circumstances would he subject himself to any such suspicions as had given rise to that controversy. He was importuned and pressed, by day and by night, by distinguished statesmen from all quarters of the Union, to accept the post. His resolution was fixed, and in reply to the argument, that as these claims were settled, and determined by a tribunal independent of the Cabinet in all its action, his delicacy was too fastidious; he sternly said, that he would never act as the Secretary of Treasury out of which any claim, in which he had either a direct or remote interest, should be paid. On this point he was immovable. His friends then suggested that he should first dispose of all his interest in those claims. To this he consented. A house in New York proposed to buy his interest. The terms were arranged; the money was paid. Mr. Corwin became divested of every interest he had, direct or indirect, in all Mexican claims, including that of Gardiner, and in this position, free and untrammelled, entered the Cabinet of Mr. Fillmore—very much, I will add, to my regret.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for the truth, substantially, of this statement, I pledge my veracity as a man, and my honor as a Representative in the American Congress. I will now read the extract from my colleague's speech:

“Through the investigation of Congress, their Galphinism has been exposed; and Crawford, loaded with the execrations of the American people, has received his passport to perpetual infamy. But Corwin still remains unwhipped of justice. True, sir, his catspaw and accomplice in the fraud, is loaded with irons, and is branded by public sentiment as a perjurer and forger; but the master-moving spirit, the head and brains, in the fraud, through the negligence of this House, is still permitted to control the Treasury of the United States. Though this House may not visit upon him retributive justice, yet the American people, remembering, in connection with this fraud, ‘his bloody hand and hospitable grave’ sentiments, and the aid and comfort he gave our enemies in time of war, will sink him so deep in infamy, ‘that the hand of resurrection will never reach him.’”

Here, Mr. Chairman, are two clear, positive, and distinct charges. First, that Mr. Corwin has been guilty of the high crime of subornation of perjury. Secondly, that he is *particeps criminis* to a most villainous fraud upon the public Treasury, over which he was appointed the people's sentinel. If my colleague were present I would extend to him now the opportunity of withdrawing unconditionally the base calumny; or I should, on behalf of my constituents, demand a statement of his proofs. But, presuming that he ventures to base his charge upon public rumor, and avails himself of the aid of her foul and irresponsible tongue, to slander my friend and constituent, that his party may gain something, I have but to say that public rumor is notoriously a “common liar,” and that the charge of these crimes upon Mr. Corwin is a willful, a malicious, and a deliberate lie.

Mr. Chairman, in relation to the other parties concerned, so far as there is a design to manufacture party capital, I have only to remark that General Waddy Thompson, of South Carolina, who was the original and leading counsel in the Gardiner claim, is now, as I learn from newspaper publications, not a supporter of General Scott, but the friend of Mr. Pierce. Major Lally, who was of the counsel in this case, is a distinguished advocate of General Pierce's election.

Mr. STANLY. He had Pierce's letter.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, he seems to be the boon companion of Pierce; for he held his private and confidential letter at the Baltimore Convention, and has since figured in Pierce meetings in New England. Sir, I dismiss the subject so far as Secretary Corwin is concerned. And, it may be proper to add, that since these charges were made by my colleague, I have never met the Secretary. In fact, sir, I have avoided him, believing, from his well-known aversion to having his name connected with public controversies, he would attempt to dissuade me from the performance of that which I regard as a duty I owed not only to him but to his neighbors who send me here, his hosts of friends everywhere, and to myself as a member of this body.

THE GALPHIN CLAIM.

A few words, Mr. Chairman, upon the subject of the "Galphin claim." Our opponents are flooding the country with publications on that subject, well calculated to deceive an unsuspecting people. This was a claim on the part of the heirs of Galphin for money expended by the ancestor in Georgia during our revolutionary struggle. I will not go into its interesting details, but will state that this expenditure, at the time when our forefathers "fought, bled, and died" for our liberties, brought down upon the head of that patriot the vengeance of old England. Such was his efficiency in the struggle for independence that a resolution passed the British Parliament attainting him for high treason, and setting a price upon his head as an outlaw and a rebel. But, sir, neither the justness of the claim, nor the interesting associations connected with it, are matters of any consequence for my present purpose. It is sufficient, for the purpose of heading the Democratic leaders in their effort to manufacture party capital out of it, to say that the Journals before me show (which no Democrat will deny) that the bill allowing the claim passed the Thirtieth Congress, and that not a single Democrat opposed its passage.

Mr. HALL. I deny that. I did not vote for it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The record may not show that you did. There was no person to raise a voice against it. Your voice, sir, if raised in opposition to it, would have defeated the bill.

Mr. HALL. That is a mistake. It was passed under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I say that under the rules, when it was acted upon, a single voice in opposition could have killed the bill. (Addressing Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia,) Am I not correct?

Mr. STEPHENS, (in his seat.) You are. Any member objecting would have defeated it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then, sir, I charge home upon the Democracy, as I have a right to do by the record, the responsibility of the measure—at least their equal share of it.

The bill allowing this Galphin claim was signed and approved by President Polk. The principal was paid by President Polk's administration. The question of allowing interest upon it was left open by that Administration. It was taken up as unfinished business by the Taylor administration. The question was one of doubt. Secretary Meredith submitted it to the Attorney General, the legal adviser of the Government upon all doubtful questions, who made an able and an

elaborate report, showing that interest should be paid. Robert J. Walker (Mr. Polk's Secretary of the Treasury) states in his testimony before the committee of investigation, on this subject, that such was the character of the question of paying the interest, that he, upon the opinion of the Attorney General, would have paid it. Thus, Mr. Chairman, do I, by these official documents, cast back upon the Democracy the responsibility of this claim.

Mr. FLORENCE. I desire to ask the gentleman a single question. Has it not been the practice always, both in Congress and in the Department, to refuse the payment of interest upon any claim?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, sir. By no means.

Mr. FLORENCE. I thought that such was the case.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not at all. The honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania only shows that he has not examined the documents in this case, and is therefore not "posted up."

I shall not now discuss the propriety of Secretary Crawford, in entering General Taylor's Cabinet whilst he had a contingent interest in this claim, nor repel the charges of my colleague against him. He has friends enough on this floor competent, fully, to that duty. On that subject it is proper to say that the very gentlemen who defended that Secretary's course during the last Congress, [Messrs. TOOMBS and STEPHENS, of Georgia,] are now giving no "aid and comfort" to the cause of General Scott, as my honorable friend before me [Mr. STEPHENS] will at any time testify. On the contrary, the weight of their influence seems to be thrown into the scale of Franklin Pierce.

Mr. Chairman, having thus, as I conceive, cleared away the stigma which our opponents have attempted to cast upon the Whig cause, by reason of these claims, I shall now charge back along their line. The fruits of all their industry and efforts to convict Whigs of frauds on the Treasury dwindle into these insignificant and frivolous charges of "Galphinism" and "Gardinerism." They vanish before the light of truth as chaff is scattered by the mighty whirlwind. But let us look into the integrity of that party to whom my colleague would have the people intrust the keeping of their Treasury.

DISHONESTY OF DEMOCRATS WHEN IN POWER.

It is my purpose, sir, to expose the gross violations of official duty, and wholesale peculations upon the public Treasury when they were the chosen sentinels to guard and defend it. "By their fruits shall ye know them." I propose, for a few minutes, to "carry the war into Africa!" As my colleague is prone to investigate antiquated issues, and "obsolete ideas," in the hope of drawing party capital from them, I will be excused for refreshing the memories of gentlemen upon the subject of past Democratic defalcations. I have risen, sir, to cast no aspersions upon the integrity of the leaders of the Democratic party which are not justified by authentic documents. I come with not vague and idle rumors, but I hold in my hand, and will read from, the records of Congress. If any gentleman questions the correctness of what I read, I desire him to make it known.

This, sir, is the second volume of the reports of

the third session of the Twenty-fifth Congress. It exposes more glaring corruption, and more barefaced frauds upon the rights of the people, during a few years of Democratic reign, than are to be found in the entire annals of the Government. I cannot go into them in detail; but call the attention of the House and the country to one specimen of the kind of practical "Reform" these Democratic leaders, who promise so much *now*, gave us *then*. From this, an honest people may judge what they may expect from them in future. It is the case between Messrs. Taney and Woodbury, Democratic Secretaries of the Treasury, and the Democratic Receiver of public moneys at Columbus, Mississippi. For want of time to read the whole, I read extracts from the correspondence:

Secretary Taney to W. P. Harris, February 7, 1834: "Receivers have been engaged in trading with the Government money. Such conduct would be regarded as a gross violation of official duty."—Page 168.

To this charge Harris pleads guilty.—Page 168.

Taney to Harris, March 6, 1834: "In regard to the returns which are required to be rendered, it becomes my duty to advise you, that those for the months of November, December, and January, are in arrear, and to say that a strict and punctual observance of this duty is indispensable."—Page 169.

Taney to Harris, March 17, 1834: "The money which is received must be deposited."—Page 169.

Taney to Harris, March 25, 1834: "The Department has received no monthly returns, showing the transactions of your office, from the month of October last."—Page 169.

Taney to Harris, May 19, 1834: Incloses copy of last letter, and says: "I again call your attention to its requirements."—Page 169.

Woodbury to Harris, February 6, 1835: "I regret that there should be occasion for again calling your attention to your omission to pay over the public funds."—Page 170.

Woodbury to Harris, February 28, 1835: "I cannot omit the occasion to impress upon you the necessity of a strict attention to, and punctual compliance with the duties required of you in regard to the prompt deposit of the public moneys."—Page 170.

Woodbury to Harris, March 17, 1835: "Having received no monthly duplicate returns of the transactions of your office since that for the month of October last, it becomes my unpleasant duty to call your immediate attention to the omission. Allow me to express a hope that there may be no further occasion to remind you of the importance of punctuality in the transmission of these returns."

Here is a beautiful specimen of *Democratic honesty*, and its efficiency in guarding our Treasury. A public officer, known at the Treasury Department for *thirteen months* to have plundered the people, is addressed by the Secretary in the cringing style of "*allow me to express a hope!*" The Secretary was truly a confiding man to indulge in a "hope," when there was no longer even "a loop whereon to hang a hope." But I proceed with this racy correspondence. Harris replies to the last polite epistle, by saying, in substance, that he *could not fork over the dollars*, because he had no "blanks" to make out his returns upon. This most potent excuse seemed, for a while, to be entirely satisfactory.

Woodbury to Harris, June 25, 1835, after reciting that he had often written to him to pay up, says: "It becomes my unpleasant duty to say to you, that if the moneys in arrear are not transmitted by return of mail, I shall be constrained to report your neglect for the action of the Executive."—Page 172.

Harris to Woodbury, July 13, 1835: "Inclosed you will receive my monthly account current for the month of December, 1834, showing a balance of three hundred and eighty-five thousand and sixty-seven dollars, and eighty-three cents."—Page 172.

Woodbury to Harris, August 28, 1835: "It has become my disagreeable duty [very "disagreeable," of course, Mr. Chair-

man,] to report your continued neglect to the President, who has instructed me to say to you, that if the monthly returns required from you by the regulations of the Treasury, which are in arrears, are not received at the Department on or before the 10th day of October next, you will then be dismissed from office."—Page 172.

Harris to Woodbury, September 14, 1835: "I ask of the President a suspension of my removal," &c.—Page 172.

Woodbury to Harris, September 22, 1835: "Allow me to inquire why your deposits are not made," &c.—Page 172.

Woodbury to Harris, September 28, 1835: "I regret to say that the reasons assigned in your letter of the 14th instant, for withholding your monthly returns, cannot hereafter be deemed satisfactory."—Page 173.

About this time matters were coming to a focus. The defaulter had exhausted all his own personal powers with the Administration, and therefore brings to bear a sort of "outside pressure" in behalf of his plunderings of the people.

September 15, 1835—*John F. H. Claiborne*, former member of Congress, I believe, from Mississippi, writes to the President as follows:

"Many of the early and constant friends of the Administration in this State have heard with much regret and sorrow, that the present receiver of public moneys at this place, is to consider himself dismissed, unless his returns are made by the 1st of October." * * * *

"Nothing would rejoice him (Poindexter) more than the expulsion of General Harris, whom he knows to be one of the main pillars of the Democratic cause, and one of the earliest and most distinguished friends of the Administration in Mississippi. His family and connections, are extremely influential, and all of them are co-operating with us in the arduous struggle which we are now making. They are true Democrats." * * * "We are now in the midst of an electioneering campaign." * * * "It will be a close contest."—Page 174.

And, he might have added, "Harris, with the people's dollars, will do good service!"

This appeal produced its effect upon the "model Democratic administration," and Harris, the receiver, known by the Democrats in power to have been plundering the Treasury for twenty months, was retained in office. But let us examine further, to see how they managed the people's affairs afterwards.

Woodbury to Harris, October 26, 1835: "I can perceive no reason why each deposit in past months should not have embraced the whole amount in your possession at the time of such deposits, as the instructions require."—Page 177.

Woodbury to Harris, November 28, 1835: "No reason whatever can be seen why the whole money in your hands at the end of the month is not deposited; it is expected that it will be hereafter."—Page 178.

Woodbury to Harris, February 4, 1836: "Your returns for the months of October, November, and December have not been received. I regret that there should be any occasion to notice the neglect or accident (as the case may be) in this important duty."—Page 178.

It is worthy of remark here that this letter was also addressed to TWENTY-TWO Democratic receivers of public moneys, under the same date, notifying them that they were defaulters. I can only take time to trace out the beauties of one case as a specimen of the integrity of the leaders of that party from which we are compelled to hear lectures upon "*honesty*."

Harris to Woodbury, March 13, 1836: "Inclosed you will receive my monthly account current for the month of November, 1835, showing a balance of FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SIX THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED AND TEN DOLLARS and fifty-nine cents."—Page 179.

Woodbury to Harris, March 28, 1836: "Your letter of the 13th instant, inclosing your return for the month of November, is received. Again it becomes my unpleasant duty to complain of your neglect in this respect." * * * "On the return of mail, therefore, if the usual statement for the other months in arrear are not received, I shall be under the disagreeable necessity of again submitting the subject to the President, for his immediate action."—Page 179.

Woodbury to Harris, June 6, 1836: "Seeing the balance

of public moneys in your hands amounted to \$123,584 70 at the end of that month, I have to request that you will explain why it was that the whole of the public moneys in your hands on the last of the previous month was not deposited instead of a part, in conformity to explicit and frequent instructions on that point. It is *painful* to be obliged to ask you so often for explanations."—Page 180.

The subject was really becoming "*painful*"—*painful* to Harris especially. On the 27th August, 1836, he writes, resigning his office, and then proceeds:

"In conclusion I will take the liberty of recommending to you for appointment of my successor, Colonel Gideon D. Boyd, of Attala county. You are probably acquainted with his public character, as he has been for several years a prominent member of our State Legislature, and has been throughout an *ardent supporter of your Administration*, and an *unyielding advocate of the principles of Democracy*. The request is made in his behalf, in part on my own account."

Now, Mr. Chairman, we shall soon see what sort of an exponent of the "*principles of Democracy*" this Boyd proved himself. Strange as it might seem to honest men of any party, the Democrats in power appointed him to the office on the sole recommendation of Harris, who had been known by the Administration to be a defaulter for *thirty months* before, and had been so notified by the Department, as I have shown, at least *seventeen times*! This is an honest management of the people's affairs with a vengeance! You employ a man to keep your money—allow him to rob you for more than two years, and then permit him to select his friend to fill his place. This is called good Democratic management of public affairs!

Well, Mr. Chairman, let us look into the stewardship of this man Boyd, the "*unyielding advocate of the principles of Democracy*"—the "*successor of his illustrious predecessor*," Harris, who stepped out, as the committee show in this report, with the small sum of only ONE HUNDRED AND NINE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-EIGHT DOLLARS AND EIGHT CENTS of the people's money.

Woodbury to Boyd, March 25, 1837: "Sir, I regret to be under the necessity of complaining of your neglect to transmit your return for the month of March last, and of reminding you that greater strictness must be observed in the performance of this duty."—Page 186.

Boyd pays no attention to instructions, and V. M. Garesche is sent out as an envoy extraordinary to "tighten up the screws" of Democracy in Mississippi, and to examine into the land office affairs. On the 14th of June, 1837, he writes to Mr. Woodbury, the Secretary of the Treasury, that Boyd is already, in a service only of some three months, a defaulter to the amount of FIFTY-FIVE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIVE DOLLARS—carrying out his unyielding "*principles of Democracy*!" He was as stern a Democrat as my colleague! I read a few extracts, on the principles of a Democratic administration, from this letter (page 189 of the document:)

"The man (Boyd) seems really penitent, and I am inclined to think, in common with his friends, he is honest."

So, doubtless, would my Democratic colleague think.

"He has been led away from his duty by the example of his predecessor, (Harris,) and a certain looseness in the code of morality which here does not move in so limited a circle as it does with us at home."

They do seem to have been plundering the

people, to use a western expression, with a "most perfect looseness!"

"Another receiver would probably follow in the footsteps of the two."

It must be remembered that "following in the footsteps" was, in these days, a favorite plank in the Democratic platform!

"You will not, therefore, be surprised if I recommend his being retained in preference to another appointment, for he has his hands full now, and will not be disposed to speculate any more. He has, moreover, pledged his word that, if retained, he will strictly obey the law."

Mr. Chairman, I never knew a convicted horse-thief who would not promise to obey the law in order to be pardoned out of the penitentiary, that he might have a chance to steal another. Speaking of the predecessor, (Harris,) this Democratic agent writes:

"He, too, passes for an honest man."

On the 24th of July, 1837, Boyd writes to the Secretary that he is a defaulter, and that he will resign, (p. 187,) and the Secretary replies, (p. 188:)

"I am happy to hear of the *frank and honorable* course proposed in your letter of the 24th ultimo."

Thus it would seem that, according to this rule of Democratic leaders, he who robs the public Treasury of \$109,000, "passes for an honest man"—he who robs it of \$50,000 *only*, and offers to resign, is regarded as "*frank and honorable*," and makes the Secretary of the Treasury "*happy*!"

Mr. Chairman, if my brief hour would permit, I could go on and show up similar cases. This large volume is filled with their details. Would that every voter throughout the land could be furnished with a copy. It would cause tens of thousands of honest Democrats indignantly to drive from power the leaders of the party, which has tolerated these outrages upon their rights, and so flagrantly abused their confidence. I could go into the cases of your Swartwouts and your Hawkinses, your Tods and your Prices, whose joint robberies amounted to more than two millions of dollars! But, sir, I turn with loathing and disgust from this mournful picture of human depravity—this official record of political infamy, on the part of Democratic leaders, some of whom are now attempting to rally their dismayed and broken forces under the banner of Franklin Pierce. I let them pass, and merely give the list in a marginal note.*

But, sir, this is not the only "Galphinizing" with which I charge the managers of that party. My colleague always harps upon the efficiency of the Sub-Treasury. They promised, for this scheme, that it would free the Government from its dependence upon banks and bankers to transact its fiscal affairs, and that by its penalties, its penitentiaries, its bolts and its bars, it would prevent further peculations upon the public Treasury. Yet, sir, the result is, that even under the Polk administration, the financial operations of the Government required the aid of banks and bankers. The terrors of all the penalties did not prevent your Wetmores, your Collinses, and your other sub-treasurers, from proving defaulters to the amount of near a million of dollars!

PUBLIC PRINTING.

That the spirit of "Galphinism" still prevails

*See list on page 16.

among the Democratic leaders, I refer to the bill now before this body, and which I predict they will carry before our adjournment, by which Mr. Ritchie is to get from the public Treasury some \$200,000 or more of the people's money, because he published the Union newspaper, and, acting upon the "higher law" principle, used his efforts to nullify the law of Congress providing for letting the public printing by contract to the lowest responsible bidder.

CONSTRUCTIVE MILEAGE.

Sir, there is still another class of Democratic *Galphinizers*. I allude to your *constructive mileage* men. Look at your Democratic members of the United States Senate. On the 4th day of March, 1851, the Senate adjourned, as did this House, at a few minutes after twelve o'clock, m. An extra session of the Senate had been called by a message from the President, to attend to Executive business. The extra session was called to order in a few minutes past twelve. Senators did not quit the Chamber. Yet, sir, we find that a large portion of the Democracy, then congregated, acted upon the *presumption* that they had traveled to and from their respective homes, and received their mileage accordingly. I have here a statement which shows that there were twenty-one Democrats who acted upon this forced presumption, whilst there were three Whigs only.

A MEMBER. There were not many Whigs there.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, sir, there were fifteen Whigs who then refused to take the constructive mileage, and only eight Democrats who so refused.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee. I wish to ask the gentleman what session he speaks of?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The close of the Thirty-first Congress.

Mr. JONES. Can the gentleman tell how many have since received this constructive mileage?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know and do not care. If any, let them meet the consequences. The statement shows that your Democratic Senators "Galphinized" upon the Treasury to the amount of about \$33,000! Here it is:

Senators who REFUSED it:

George E. Budger, N. C.
John Bell, Tennessee.
John M. Berrien, Ga.
James W. Bradbury, Me.
Jesse D. Bright, Ind.
Andrew P. Butler, S. C.
Lewis Cass, Michigan.
SALMON P. CHASE, O.
John H. Clarke, R. I.
Henry Clay, Kentucky.
John Davis, Mass.
Jefferson Davis, Miss.
William C. Dawson, Ga.
R. M. T. Hunter, Va.
Wm. R. King, Alabama.
Willie P. Mangum, N. C.
James M. Mason, Va.
Jacob W. Miller, N. J.
James A. Pearce, Md.
Thomas G. Pratt, Md.
William H. Seward, N. Y.
Truman Smith, Conn.
Presley Spruance, Del.
Jos. R. Underwood, Ky.

Senators who TOOK it:

David R. Atchison, Mo. \$1,696
Solon Borland, Ark. 1,808
Jeremiah Clemons, Ala. 1,940
James Cooper, Penn. 184
Augustus C. Dodge, Iowa 1,440
Henry Dodge, Wis. 1,584
Stephen A. Douglas, Ill. 1,084
Solomon W. Downs, La. 2,240
Alpheus F. Ich, Mich. 896
Henry S. Foote, Miss. 2,064
William M. Gwin, Cal. 4,008
JOHN P. HALE, N. H. 453
Hannibal Hamlin, Me. 590
Sam Houston, Texas. 2,495
George W. Jones, Iowa. 1,600
Jackson Morton, Fla. 1,336
Moses Norris, jr., N. H. 472
R. Barnwell Rhett, S. C. 512
Thomas R. Rusk, Texas. 2,347
Wm. K. Sebastian, Ark. 1,520
James Shields, Ill. 1,341
Pierre Soulé, La. 2,074
William Upham, Vt. 520
Isaac P. Walker, Wis. 1,584
James Whitcomb, Ind. 812

Total amount. \$35,719

Whigs in italics. Free-Soilers in SMALL CAPITALS.

It seems that the Senator from California, [Mr. GWIN,] "Galphinized" the snug sum of \$4,000, on the presumption that he had traveled to San Francisco, by the "fast line," in about five minutes, when, in truth, he did not, I suppose, so much as rise from his cushioned arm chair; not disturbed, perhaps, in his comfortable nap, rendered pleasant by the "fatigues" of the previous night-session. And, sir, this is the same "Galphinizer" who stands at the head of your Democratic Executive Committee, and is calling lustily through the public press, for lists of names to whom may be sent electioneering papers to expose what is termed Whig Galphinisms! In his eyes, it seems an awful fraud to pay interest on money paid to whip England in our Revolution, and perfectly just to pocket \$4,000 traveling fees, under such circumstances.

Mr. INGERSOLL. I ask the gentleman to allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. My brief hour runs rapidly, and I have much more to say. I cannot yield, unless I have said something that is personally offensive to you.

Mr. Chairman, I dismiss this examination and comparison of Galphinisms. I have maintained the integrity of the Whigs in power, and exposed the frauds of their opponents. There are other points in my colleague's speech to which I must advert. Much that he has said is but the repetition of his old and stale stump speeches in Ohio, made a thousand times, and answered as often; and which any of our buckeye farmer boys can answer successfully at their district school-house meetings, on winter evenings. His old song of "alien and sedition laws," &c., I therefore pass. He says:

"Now, sir, I assert, without the fear of contradiction, that for fifty years every distinctive measure of policy, advocated and supported by the anti-Democratic party, in opposition to the Democracy, has been measurably abandoned by the party, and condemned by the verdict of the American people. And upon the other hand, I assert with equal confidence, that for more than half a century, every distinctive measure of policy, advocated and supported by the Democracy, and opposed by the anti-Democratic party, is still part and parcel of the Democratic creed, and has merited and received the approbation of the people of the United States."

Mr. Chairman, I do contradict it. I assert that the records show the reverse of this proposition to be true.

BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

My colleague always drags up this dead monster. He assumes that General Scott is for a bank *now*, because in 1841 he expressed himself in favor of such an institution. By the same reasoning my colleague proves that he is himself now in favor of it, because he admits that he is a renegade Whig, and was about those days in favor of a United States Bank. That he has *personal reasons* for opposing banking institutions, I cannot deny. He has had some experience in the shin-plaster business, having once been a subscriber to stock to the amount of \$250,000 in a manufactory of that sort in Ohio. For proof that he did not pay up the stock, and for the fact, of which I have been informed, that his name disappeared from the stock books in a most mysterious manner, I beg leave to refer him to *his own deposition* now on file in one of the Ohio courts.

Mr. Chairman, we have had two United States Banks. Washington approved the first charter.

The Democratic party, in 1816, chartered the second, and Madison approved the bill—William R. King, my colleague's candidate for the Vice Presidency, voting for it. In 1832, a bill passed Congress. George M. Dallas, a leader of Democracy, reported the bill in the United States Senate. His Democratic colleague, Senator Wilkins, voted for it. The Democracy of Pennsylvania were almost a unit in its favor. Her representation in this Hall stood twenty-four for, and only one against it. Her Legislature resolved *unanimously* in favor of the institution. Yet, sir, subsequently the party abandoned the policy and planted itself upon the support of

STATE BANKS.

The party recommended the "pet bank system." It exploded, and brought distress upon the country. They then abandoned that.

A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

In 1824 and in 1828, the Democratic party claimed to be the original supporters of the protective policy. "Protection for the sake of protection," was their motto. General Jackson avowed the principle in his "Coleman letter," as he did in one of his messages after he was elected to the Presidency. In 1828, the party voted for the highest and strongest protection bill ever passed by an American Congress. Subsequently they abandoned that policy, whilst the Whigs have steadfastly supported it. My colleague says the Democrats are now against that policy, which is one truth for which I willingly give him credit. Yet, sir, in speaking of the *ad valorem* policy of duties, which distinguish their tariff of 1846, the gentleman, whose ideas seem to turn instinctively upon liquor, spoke of the effect of duties on the poor man's brandy, and omitted to state that even by that law they abandoned their recently-adopted principle of "*ad valorem*," and placed a protective duty and a tax upon the poor man's sugar.

INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.

The Democratic party, everywhere, from 1828 to 1832, avowed themselves in favor of a system of internal improvements by the General Government. Subsequently they abandoned it, and their Executive vetoes fell thick and fast upon the measures of Congress for the improvement of rivers and harbors. The Whigs adhered to the policy through good report and through evil report. Now, sir, the Whig policy prevails. The pressure of popular sentiment has forced this Congress, with its heavy Democratic majority, to yield a triumph to Whig policy in this respect.

LAND DISTRIBUTION.

This was a measure of the Whig party, passed by Whig votes in 1832, under the lead of Clay, and defeated by the veto of a Democratic President. Yet, sir, in the last Congress the wet lands were distributed amongst the States in which they are located, by the aid of a large Democratic vote—a distribution which was, perhaps, partial and unjust to the States in which no such lands were situate. A few weeks ago, and soon after the Democrats, at Baltimore, put the anti-distribution plank in their platform, this House, with its Democratic majority of fifty, passed the bill introduced by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. BENNETT,] distributing a large portion of the public domain among the States. Here, sir, is another

instance of the success of an important Whig measure, and of the abandonment of its long-adhered-to policy by the Democratic party.

ANNEXATION OF TEXAS.

The consistency of the Democratic party in Ohio on this measure may be better understood by reference to the journals of the Legislature of that State, which show that when it was first proposed the Democrats almost unanimously voted against the proposition to annex. They subsequently abandoned their opposition, when the leaders found it necessary in order to secure the "spoils of office."

THE BANKRUPT LAW.

This was originally a Democratic measure. Mr. Van Buren, when at the head of that party, was in its favor; and Mr. Walker, late Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, claimed the paternity of the law. The Whig Congress, yielding to Democratic advice, passed the law; but finding that it was fraught with practical disadvantages, they very properly yielded to public opinion, and repealed it. That is the whole story on this point.

GENERAL SCOTT AND THE FOREIGNERS.

My colleague assails General Scott in regard to his views on naturalization. He finds him, he thinks, "*long time ago*," in favor of placing too heavy restrictions upon the right of foreigners to vote—*now*, too liberal. My colleague's facts and arguments seem to neutralize each other. On this point of opposition, without inquiring, or caring, whether General Scott is the author of the anonymous article signed "*Americus*," which my colleague has discovered in some old musty newspaper, I content myself with the following letters, which express very frankly his opinions *at the present time*:

WASHINGTON, May 29, 1848.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your kind letter of the 8th instant, I take pleasure in saying that, grateful for the too partial estimate you place on my public services, you do me no more than justice in assuming that I entertain "kind and liberal views towards our naturalized citizens." Certainly *it would be impossible for me to recommend or support any measure intended to exclude them from a just and full participation in all civil and political rights now secured to them by our republican laws and institutions.*

It is true that, in a case of unusual excitement some years ago, when both parties complained of fraudulent practices in the naturalization of foreigners, and when there seemed to be danger that native and adopted citizens would be permanently arrayed against each other in hostile faction, *I was inclined to concur in the opinion then avowed by leading statesmen, that some modification of the naturalization laws might be necessary in order to prevent abuses, allay strife, and restore harmony between the different classes of our people. But later experience and reflection have entirely removed this impression and dissipated my apprehensions.*

In my recent campaign in Mexico, a very large portion of the men under my command were your countrymen—Irish, Germans, &c. I witnessed with admiration their zeal, fidelity, and valor, in maintaining our flag in the face of every danger, vying with each other, and our native-born soldiers in the same ranks, in patriotism, constancy, and heroic daring. *I was happy to call them brothers in the field, as I shall always be happy to salute them as countrymen at home.*

I remain, sir, with great esteem, yours truly,

WINFIELD SCOTT.

WILLIAM E. ROBINSON, E-q.

WASHINGTON, March 11, 1852.

GENTLEMEN: I have received your note, inviting me to join you at Philadelphia in the celebration of the approaching St. Patrick's day—an honor which, I regret, the press of business obliges me to decline.

You do me but justice in supposing me to feel a lively interest in Ireland and her sons. Perhaps no man, certainly

no American, owes so much to the valor and blood of Irishmen as myself. *Many of them marched and fought under my command in the war of 1812-'13, and many more (thousands) in the recent war with Mexico, not one of whom was ever known to turn his back upon the enemy, or a friend.*

I salute you, gentlemen, with my cordial respects.

WINFIELD SCOTT.

R. TYLER, C. McCULLAY, W. DICKSON P. W. CONROY, and J. McCANN, E-q's., Committee, &c.

After the conquest of Mexico, on his return to the United States, he was met at Elizabethtown, New Jersey, and in reply to an address by Alderman Franklin, said:

"You have been pleased, sir, to allude to our adopted citizens. I can say that the Irish, the Germans, the Swiss, the French, the Britons, and other adopted citizens, fought in the same ranks, under the same colors, side by side with native-born Americans—exhibiting like courage and efficiency, and uniting at every victory in the same enthusiastic shouts in honor of our flag and country. From Vera Cruz to the city of Mexico, *there was one generous rivalry in heroic daring and brilliant achievements.* Let those who witnessed that career of valor and patriotism say, if they can, what race, according to numbers, contributed most to the general success and glory of the campaign. On the many hard-fought battles there was no room for invidious distinction. *All proved themselves the faithful sons of our beloved country, and no spectator could fail to dismiss any imaginary prejudice he might have entertained as to the comparative merits of Americans by birth and Americans by adoption.*"

That, I think, will answer, especially when we remind ourselves of the fact that Franklin Pierce, a Democrat of overwhelming influence in the State of New Hampshire, where the Democracy have always had an immense majority, belongs to the party which has retained in the constitution of that State the clause excluding all persons from holding office who are not of the Protestant religion, is General Scott's opponent.

In addition to these expressions of opinion, were it necessary to go further to place General Scott in his true light before the country, I need but remind the people of the fact that the late convention of the "Native American party" repudiated him and nominated another person as their candidate for the Presidency.

But General Scott's "new plank" on this subject has disturbed the repose of my colleague, as well as of the honorable gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. TOOMBS.] It is a little remarkable, that whilst every other person on this floor is assailing General Scott's views on the vexed question of slavery, my colleague most carefully avoids approaching that subject. Not a word from him on the merits of the fugitive slave law. Why is this? My colleague dodged the vote on the passage of the bill in the last Congress, and he has dodged the vote on the "Hillyer resolution," indorsing it in this. Does he wish to be understood as being for the "totality and finality" here, and in favor of modifications of that law amongst his Free-Soil constituents at home? It would have been interesting to us, though perhaps not profitable to him, to have heard him on that subject. But he flies off to the "alien and sedition laws," and the naturalization hobby, and anon regards the proposition to allow a foreigner a vote who fights our battles one year as most iniquitous! Now, Mr. Chairman, I regard that foreigner who casts his lot in this "land of the free," and faces the cannon's mouth of our enemy under our glorious stars and stripes, as quite as deserving the right of suffrage as the one who may locate in my colleague's district, sell whisky at the cross roads, and elec-

tioneer for him as a candidate for Congress. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAYLORD. It is in your district where they make whisky. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. True, sir. The difference between us is simply this: we make it—you drink it. [Laughter.]

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I call for the enforcement of the "Maine liquor law!" [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. That might improve both the manners and habits of some members.

SLAVERY.

General Scott has been assailed most bitterly on this floor in regard to his views upon slavery. I do not propose to renew the discussion upon that subject now. I have made no effort to do so during this session, because I have been unable to see the advantages to any portion of the country to be derived from it; and at this late period, when we are all preparing to separate, some of us, perhaps, to meet no more forever, I have no desire to stir up the embittered feelings which are, and must, in the nature of things, continue to be the unavoidable fruits of such discussions. At a proper time I am ready to meet the issue. For myself, I have but to say that my sentiments have been recorded, and I stand where I have ever stood. My principles are my own, and I shall not allow any party, or any political platform-making conventions, to change them until my own judgment satisfies me I am in error.

The honorable gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TOOMBS] bases his opposition to General Scott upon the reasons given in the extract which I quote from his speech of July 3d:

"General Scott would have acted wisely and well not to have invited scrutiny into his past opinions on slavery. *There are no known incidents in that life which commends itself upon these great questions to the approbation of a southern man. Point to it.* He is a faithful soldier and an honorable man, I know. That he will do what he says, I believe. I object that he has not said what we require; that he has not pledged himself to stand by and firmly carry out the great principles, and, therefore, as I believe him to be true to his own principles, and honest in holding them, I will not trust him where it is not clear that they agree with mine.

"My hour, I am informed, is near its termination; and I shall, therefore, be compelled to pass by his Canada letter, to which I intended to make reference. I intended to examine his Atkinson letter, and to show that every one of the incidents of that history to which he has so unwisely invited the scrutiny of the people is against him, and speak trumpet-tongued against his being trusted upon this great question. I do not know of a single sentiment ever uttered by General Scott in relation to the principles settled by the compromise, or in relation to the subject of slavery in general, that is in unison with my own or the convictions of the slaveholding States of this Union. If he had stood upon these great questions where he ought to have stood, there would have been no need for his friend, the Senator from New York, [Mr. SEWARD.] attempting to relieve him by a letter to the public from somewhat of the odium of his alliance. But he did not stand there. For more than a year General Scott has been the known candidate of the Free-Soil wing of the Whig party."

The honorable gentleman "*intended to examine his Atkinson letter.*" And in reply to a courteous inquiry made by myself, he kindly proffered to give me his own entire history but for the want of time. What he has omitted, I may, in part, undertake to perform.

Again: that gentleman, his colleagues, [Messrs. STEPHENS and JOHNSON,] and other southern gentlemen, issued their *pronunciamiento* against Gen-

eral Scott, on the 5th of July, the thirty-eighth anniversary of the gallant chieftain's battle of Chippewa. In it they say:

"Among these 'known incidents' of his life there is not one, so far as we are aware of, in favor of the principles of the compromise. In one, at least, of his public letters, he has expressed sentiments inimical to the institutions of fifteen States of the Union." * * *

"We consider General Scott as the favorite candidate of the Free-Soil wing of the Whig party."

This opposition is founded upon General Scott's letter of 1843, on the subject of slavery, written to Mr. Atkinson, of Pennsylvania. That is to these gentlemen the fatal "incident"—for it is his only letter on the subject of slavery and kindred questions which has ever been published—for aught I know, the only one he has ever written. I propose to examine it, and to show by comparison, that these opinions are justified by quite as high authority as that of gentlemen who now assail it. And, sir, I will prove that, although these assailants, in their misguided zeal in behalf of slavery, find nothing in it which "commends itself to the approbation of a southern man," they are but the identical sentiments which were inculcated in General Scott's mind by the efforts of true and tried statesmen of the South, in whose wisdom, patriotism, and virtue no reasonable man, North or South, can hesitate to place the most implicit confidence.

EMANCIPATION.

General Washington wrote to General La Fayette under date Mount Vernon, May 10, 1796:

"To set the slaves afloat at once, would, I really believe, be productive of much inconvenience and mischief; but by degrees it certainly might, and assuredly ought to be effected, and that, too, by legislative authority."

General Scott wrote to D. P. Atkinson under date Washington, February 9, 1843:

"I own, myself, no slaves, but never have attached blame to masters for not liberating their slaves—well knowing that liberation without the means of sending them in comfort to some position favorable to the pursuit of happiness, would, in most cases, be highly injurious to all around, as well as to the manumitted families themselves, unless the operation were general, and under the auspices of prudent legislation. But I am persuaded that it is a high moral obligation of masters and slaveholding States to employ all means not incompatible with the safety of both colors, to meliorate slavery, even to extermination."

Mr. JEFFERSON wrote a letter to the convention of delegates from the different provinces, which assembled in Philadelphia in 1774, as follows:—(See American Archives, 1st vol. 4th series, page 696.)

"THE ABOLITION OF DOMESTIC SLAVERY IS THE GREATEST OBJECT OF DESIRE IN THESE COLONIES, where it was unhappily introduced in their infant state. But previous to the enfranchisement of the slaves we have, it is necessary to exclude all further importations from Africa. Yet our repeated attempts to effect this by prohibitions, and by imposing duties which might amount to prohibition, have been hitherto defeated by His Majesty's negative. Thus preferring the immediate advantages of a few African corsairs to the LASTING INTEREST of the American States, and to the RIGHTS OF HUMAN NATURE DEEPLY WOUNDED BY THIS INFAMOUS TRAFFIC."

GEORGIA MEN OF THE REVOLUTION.

The noble sires of the Georgians who now assail the expression of General Scott's opinions

above quoted, assembled on the 12th day of January, 1775, and made to the world the following declaration of their principles on slavery: (see American Archives, 1st vol. 4th series, p. 1136:)

"We, therefore, the representatives of the extensive district of Darien, in the Colony of Georgia, having now assembled in Congress, by authority and free choice of the inhabitants of said district, now freed from their fetters, do resolve:

"5. To show the world that we are not influenced by any contracted or interested motives, but a general philanthropy for ALL MANKIND, of whatever climate, language or complexion, we hereby declare our disapprobation and abhorrence of the unnatural practice of slavery in America, (however the uncultivated state of our country or other specious arguments may plead for it,) a practice founded in injustice and cruelty, and highly dangerous to our liberties, (as well as lives,) debasing part of our fellow-creatures below men, and corrupting the virtue and morals of the rest, and is laying the basis of that liberty we contend for, (and which we pray the Almighty to continue to the latest posterity,) upon a very wrong foundation. We therefore resolve, at all times, to use our utmost endeavors for the manumission of our slaves in this colony, upon the most safe and equitable footing for the master and themselves."

SOUTHERN MEN OF THE REVOLUTION.

A similar pledge was made at Philadelphia, on the 20th October, 1774, (see American Archives, same vol.,) and signed by the following list of southern patriots, and others, who subsequently subscribed the Declaration of Independence:

Maryland.—Matthew Tilghman, Thomas Johnson, jr., William Paca, Samuel Chase.

Virginia.—Richard Henry Lee, George Washington, Patrick Henry, jr., Richard Bland, Benjamin Harrison, Edmund Pendleton.

North Carolina.—William Hooper, Joseph Hewes, Richard Caswell.

South Carolina.—Henry Middleton, Thomas Lynch, Christopher Gadsden, John Rutledge, Edward Rutledge.

But, Mr. Chairman, I quote now from those who have spoken in our own time. I hold in my hand an old pamphlet, which is a copy of a speech delivered in this Hall—yes, sir, from the very desk you now occupy—by a distinguished southern slaveholding statesman, in 1827, over whose newly-made grave the nation now mourns. I will read an extract, which I commend to the special attention of those southern gentlemen who a short time since, on a sad occasion in this Hall, were so eloquent in their eulogies upon the virtues, the wisdom, and patriotism of that great man. It contains the sentiments which he subsequently impressed upon the people of his own State. This, sir, is the identical pamphlet from which I received, in early youth, the impressions I bring into this Hall. I prize it highly. I read it, too, because it fixes the time when, and not till when, there is to be a "finality" to all agitation on this subject. Mr. Clay most eloquently said:

"What would they, who thus reproach us, have done? If they would repress all tendencies towards liberty, and ultimate emancipation, they must do more than put down the benevolent efforts of this society. They must go back to the era of our liberty and independence, and muzzle the cannon which thunders its annual joyous return. They must revive the slave trade, with all its train of atrocities." * * * * * *"They must blow out the moral lights around us, and extinguish that greatest torch of all which America presents to a benighted world, pointing the way to their rights, their liberties, and their happiness. And when they have achieved all these purposes, their work will be yet incomplete. They must penetrate the human soul, and eradicate the light of reason and the love of liberty. Then, and not till then, when universal darkness and despair prevail, can you perpetuate slavery and repress all sympathies, and all humane and benevolent efforts among freemen, in behalf of the unhappy portion of our race who are doomed to bondage."*

"Our friends who are cursed with this greatest of human

evils, deserve the kindest attention and consideration. Their property and their safety are both involved. But the liberal and candid among them will not, cannot, expect that every project to deliver our country from it is to be crushed because of a possible and ideal danger."

Yes, sir, there is the finality. You may have vexatious and bitter debates in this Hall; you may pass your laws and your resolutions reaffirming them; you may make and unmake your political platforms; you may elect, or, perchance, defeat General Scott, because of the emancipation "incident" of his life, or the manner in which he may have accepted your platform; but you cannot stop all agitation until you first possess yourselves of the attributes of the Omnipotent God, and destroy those sympathies which he has implanted in the soul of man, and which adorn and dignify his character. Such, sir, were the opinions of the great statesman of Kentucky, reiterated in his speech at Lexington, in 1848, from which I quote:

"My opinions on the subject of slavery are well known. They have the merit, if it be one, of consistency, uniformity, and long duration. I have ever regarded slavery as a great evil—a wrong, for the present—I fear an irredeemable wrong to its unfortunate victims. I should rejoice if not a single slave breathed the air, or was within the limits of our country."

Mr. Chairman, I have many more authorities to justify General Scott, as well as those of us whom these bolters would excommunicate from the Whig party, before they will consent to vote for our candidate. I could consume, not merely an hour, but a whole day, by quoting similar opinions expressed by great men and by small men of the South; but having justified this "incident" in General Scott's life, by the *highest southern authority*, I must pass on.

CAMPAIGN PLEDGES.

The gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. Toombs,] and others, complain that General Scott did not give a *written pledge* to support the compromise measures, prior to the nomination. There may, perhaps, be some "incidents" in that gentleman's political history quite as vulnerable as those of General Scott. If scrutinized, they might materially weaken his present position. If I am correctly informed, that gentleman joined the Whig ranks in 1840. General Harrison was then the standard-bearer. Let us examine the principles, on this point of *pledges*, which were then inscribed upon the banner which won to its support the efficient aid of the gentleman from Georgia. General Harrison, in his letter to the New York Legislature, said:

"A better guarantee for the correct conduct of a Chief Magistrate may be found in his character and the course of his former life, than in pledges and opinions given during the pendency of a doubtful contest." * * * * *

"As it regards the subjects upon which the Legislature may be called to act, the pledges and opinions should be required, if required at all, of the candidates for Congress."

In his celebrated speech at Dayton, Ohio, in that renowned campaign, GENERAL HARRISON again said, (*Niles' Register*, vol. 59, p. 70:)

"If the candidate for so high an office be designated by the will of a portion, or a majority of the people, they will have come to the determination of sustaining such a man from a review of his past actions and life; they will not exact pledges from him of what he will do, and what he will not do, for their selection of him is proof enough that he will carry out the doctrines of his party. This plan of choosing a candidate is a much surer bar against corruption than the system of requiring promises. If the pledging plan is pursued, the effect will be, to offer the presidential chair to the man who will make the *most* promises. He who would pledge most, he who would promise most, would be

the man to be voted for, and I have no hesitation in declaring my belief, that he who would thus subject his course to be thus tied up by promises and pledges, would not stop to break them when once in office. Are my views on this topic correct, or are they not?" [Here the immense mass of people exclaimed "They are!" "They are!"]

In 1848, the honorable gentleman from Georgia was prominent in shaping the course of that contest. GENERAL TAYLOR'S letter to CAPTAIN ALLISON was the document of the canvass. We begged for something more, but the gentleman contended that it was the embodiment of Whig doctrines. On the subject of pledges, that letter says:

"Crude impressions upon matters of policy which may be right to-day and wrong to-morrow, are perhaps not the best test of fitness for office. One who cannot be trusted without pledges cannot be confided in merely on account of them." * * * * *

"If the American people have not confidence in me they ought not to give me their suffrages." * * * * *

"Indeed, I have thought for many years past, the known wishes and opinions of the Executive have exercised undue and injurious influence upon the legislative Department of the Government, and for this cause I have thought our system was undergoing a great change from its true theory."

On the 1st day of July, 1848, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] made a speech, in which he eloquently expounded the doctrine of "platforms." After quoting this Allison letter, he says:

"This is General Taylor's 'platform.' It is constructed out of constitutional materials, and is broad enough and strong enough to hold every man who does not prefer party to his country. He made it, and stood open before the nation; it was approved by the people and the Whig party; therefore, the convention of Whigs who met at Philadelphia on the 7th of June, but gave utterance to the national voice, and to the voice of their constituents, when they adopted General Taylor as their candidate, and supported him upon his own platform. The Whigs do not fear to trust those measures which they deem important to the public welfare, to the uncontrolled judgment of the people, speaking through their constitutional agents for legislation."

Well, sir, General Scott was persuaded (by the gentleman perhaps) that this was the true position. He joined with him cordially in the support of General Taylor and this platform, thus recommended for its "breadth" and "strength." He learned the lesson on campaign pledges, as he did upon slavery, from our Southern friends. And now that he has practiced upon the gentleman's own precepts, he is assailed for it. Is there any fairness in this? Is there consistency in it? Is there statesmanship in it? Is there, I ask, good common sense in it? Neither, sir, neither. If the gentleman from Georgia could "jump Jim Crow," and turn a political somerset, General Scott could not—would not. The gentleman, assuming the command, issued the word of "'bout face!" but the old campaigner, not recognizing the right in a rank-and-file recruit, *who had evinced a determination to desert and join the enemy*, refused to obey, and marched straight forward, according to the most approved discipline and usage of the Whig party. At this, the honorable gentleman became exceeding wroth, and we find him now a fugitive from the Whig party. That, sir, is the whole story, and the question of consistency is respectfully submitted to his own deliberation, in his leisure moments, after he shall have finished giving "aid and comfort" to the Democracy, and his effort to fix up a "Union party" shall have more completely "fizzled out!"

THE RIGHT OF PETITION.

If this right, guarantied by the Constitution, is

withheld upon *one subject*, it may be upon *every other*. It is important to understand the position of candidates and of parties upon it. General Pierce and his party are recorded against it. General Scott declared his opinion in the Atkinson letter, and this is another of the objectionable "incidents:"

"I have from the first been of opinion that Congress was bound by the Constitution to receive, to refer, and to report upon petitions relating to domestic slavery, as in the case of all other petitions; but I have not failed to see and to regret the unavoidable irritation which the former have produced in the southern States, with the consequent peril to the two colors, whereby the adoption of any plan of emancipation has everywhere among us been greatly retarded."

These views are in exact accordance with the opinions eloquently expressed and advocated by Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and other distinguished statesmen, in the United States Senate, in 1839, as will be seen by reference to the debates.

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Here is another "incident." It is the frank expression of a very conservative opinion on this subject, in the Atkinson letter. It is the same that has often been avowed by leading statesmen, North and South. It has been recently indorsed by the National Intelligencer, and other leading papers published in the South, as sound doctrine:

"I suppose I scarcely need say, that, in my opinion, Congress has no color of authority under the Constitution for touching the relation of master and slave within a State.

"I hold the opposite opinion in respect to the District of Columbia. Here, with the consent of the owners, or on the payment of 'just compensation,' Congress may legislate at its discretion. But my conviction is equally strong that, unless it be step by step with the Legislatures of Virginia and Maryland, it would be dangerous to both races in those States to touch the relation between master and slave in this District."

ONE PRESIDENTIAL TERM.

General Scott, as early as 1841, defined his position as follows:

"Of the eight Chief Magistrates that preceded General Harrison—whom the nation yet mourns—the first, third, fourth, fifth, and seventh, presided over this Union, respectively, two successive terms; the other three but four years each; and every one of the eight, whilst in office, became a candidate for a second term.

"I am, however, in favor of an amendment of the Constitution, in one of the forms prescribed, declaring that no citizen should be eligible to a reelection to the Presidency; and also of an extension of the term to that of a Senator—a period of six years.

This, too, is the doctrine espoused by Mr. Clay, and approved by the whole National Whig party, in its former contests.

THE VETO POWER.

This was designed, by the framers of the Constitution, as a conservative power, to enable the President to protect the other Departments of the Government from the encroachments of the Legislature. It has, however, so often been made by Democratic Presidents the means of defeating

tariffs, bills to improve rivers and harbors, and other salutary acts passed by the Representatives of the people, that, for twenty years, its practical restriction has been made a prominent tenet in the Whig faith. It is worthy a remark, sir, that since the inauguration of General Taylor, not a single measure passed by the Representatives of the people has been defeated by means of the veto.

General Scott, in his letter dated Washington October 25, 1841, said:

"*The Executive Veto.*—This, by the framers of the Constitution, could only have been designed—1. To enable the President to defend his own rightful powers against usurpations on the part of Congress. 2. To enable him to forbid other legislative infractions of the Constitution; and, 3. To guard the country against other acts of hasty or violent legislation."

"I hope, then, by an early amendment of the Constitution, to see a reduction of the President's veto. The regulation of patronage would properly follow.

"There can be no good reason why the veto should not be overcome by a bare majority in each House of Congress of all the members elected to it—say, for the benefit of reflection, at the end of ten days from the return of the bill. An amendment to this effect would leave the President—the general representative of every State and district—armed with the votes of all the members absent at the moment from the respective Houses; and there will always be some absent from both."

General Harrison, in his letter to Sherrod Williams, said:

"I consider the qualified veto upon the acts of the Legislature, conferred by the Constitution upon the President, as a conservative power, intended only to be used to secure the instrument itself from violation, or, in times of high party excitement, to protect the rights of the minority, and the interests of the weaker members of the Union."

The extent of the veto power over the will of the people, may well alarm the true Republican and the State-Rights man. The difference between a majority of this House, the popular branch of the Congress, and two thirds, which is the requisite vote to overcome a veto, is *sixty* members. There are eighteen sovereign States of this Union, that send here only sixty Representatives. So that it may be seen the President, in addition to his other vast powers, holds a negative power over legislation equal to that of a majority of the States of the Union. Franklin Pierce and his party are pledged to exercise that power, if a particular law is passed, though there may be no

Henry Clay, in the Senate of the United States, in 1842, proposed the following amendment to the Constitution:

"When a bill, which shall have passed the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, shall be returned by the President, with his objections to his approbation and signature, if, upon its reconsideration, it shall again pass each House by a majority of all the members belonging to such House, notwithstanding the President's objection, it shall become a law, and the requisition by the existing Constitution of two-thirds of each House again to pass the bill in such cases, is hereby annulled."

General Taylor, in his Allison letter, to Captain Allison, said:

"The power given by the Constitution to the Executive, to interpose his veto, is a high conservative power, but, in my opinion, should never be exercised, except in cases of clear violation of the Constitution, or manifest haste and want of consideration by Congress."

infraction of the Constitution. If this power may be thus exercised in one case, it may be in another. Yet honorable gentlemen, who talk eloquently about State-Rights, State sovereignty, &c., are first to raise a shout for "Pierce and the Veto!"

EXECUTIVE INFLUENCE.

The enormous and increasing patronage of the President, connected with the veto power as it has been practically brought to bear in defeating the popular will, is a point to which every eye, jealous of the Republican rights which it was the design of the framers of our form of Government to secure, should be vigilantly directed.

GENERAL SCOTT, on this subject, in his letter of 1841 says:

"Agency of the President in Legislation.—1. I am persuaded that this should be strictly limited. 2. To the veto qualified as suggested above. 3. To the command of the Constitution, 'he shall, from time to time, give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient;' and 4. To furnishing, through the appropriate Executive Departments, such details for bills as any committee of either House of Congress may specially call for."

GENERAL TAYLOR said, in his Allison letter:

"The personal opinions of the individual who may happen to occupy the Executive chair, ought not to control the action of Congress upon questions of domestic policy; nor ought his objections to be interposed where questions of constitutional power have been settled by the various Departments of Government, and acquiesced in by the people."

GENERAL HARRISON said, in his speech at Dayton, in 1840:

"Power is power, it matters not by what name it is called. The head of Government exercising monarchical power, may be named King, Emperor, President, Imam, still he is a monarch. But this is not all. The President of these United States exercises a power superior to that vested in the hands of nearly all the European kings. It is a power far greater than that ever dreamed of by the old Federal party."

HON. MEREDETH P. GENTRY, in a speech delivered in this House in March, 1842, said:

"What, sir, is to be the result of this war of the Executive against the legislative branch of the Government?" * * * "It is a war between the prerogative of the President and the supremacy of the popular will, as represented in the Congress of the United States. It behooves every man in taking his position with reference to this struggle to bear in mind that *he identifies himself in principle, to some extent, with those tyrants who have warred against freedom, or with Hampden and Sidney, and that host of worthies who have made their names glorious by the services which they have rendered in behalf of the rights and liberties of mankind!*"

HON. A. H. H. STUART, (present Secretary of the Interior,) in a speech delivered in this House, in July, 1842, said, in regard to the increase of executive power over legislation:

"If it be tolerated, you had as well surrender the whole legislative power in the hands of the President. He will possess it substantially through the agency of his power to recommend and his power to forbid. Why should we retain the shadow, when the substance is gone? Give him the power to recommend what laws you shall pass, and the unqualified power to forbid your passing any that do not conform to his recommendations, and what more is necessary to invest him with absolute legislative authority?" * * * "If we stand here merely to register Executive edicts, where is the necessity of going through the forms of consultation and deliberation? Why not suffer the laws to be promulgated at once from the Executive mansion, without the intervention of a ambrous legislative assembly? Or, why shall we not, when we assemble here in obedience to the letter of the Constitution, at once make an address to his Majesty, the President, and beg that he will condescend, at his earliest convenience, to inform us what laws are, in his opinion, necessary and proper to promote the interests and happiness of the people, and in what

form they will be most likely to receive His Majesty's gracious approbation?"

HON. THOMAS L. CLINGMAN, in a speech delivered in this House, March 7, 1844, said:

"Under their [the Democratic party] system the Executive power is advancing with rapid strides, the public morals are daily becoming more and more corrupt, and unless it be arrested our liberties will be lost." * * * * *

"To resist the downward tendency of things, the great Whig party are united to a man now, as they ever have been against the extension of Executive power. As a means of effecting its reduction to proper limits, they are for a single presidential term; for the modification of the veto power; for the separation of the purse and the sword; for the reduction of patronage; for the non-interference of Government officers in elections, and for the rigid supervision of all Executive officers by Congress."

At the Whig ratification meeting at Baltimore, held the day following the National Convention, which nominated Mr. Clay, the following resolution was offered by Hon. THOMAS Y. WALSH, and adopted by acclamation:

"Resolved, That the practical restriction of the veto power, which has grown, by repeated incroachments, into a mighty engine of Executive despotism, the limitation of a President to a single term, the retrenchment of our national expenditures by every practicable means, the reform of the now glaring abuses and corruptions, and abuses growing out of an unworthy bestowal of Executive patronage, and the general reductions and burdens and increase of benefits resulting to the people from the existence and operations of the Federal Government, are objects for which the Whig party will unceasingly strive until their efforts are crowned with a signal and triumphant success."

Mr. Chairman, I think I have quoted enough Southern authority to justify every political sentiment, whether on the subject of slavery or any other question of public interest, which General Scott has ever uttered. I do not pretend that his opinions accord with my own in all respects, nor, sir, shall I exact that. He makes no Procrustean bed for me; I desire to make none for him. It is enough for me to know that upon the great principles on which our republican system is founded, viz: that the representatives of the people shall make law, that the judiciary shall expound it, that the executive shall enforce it, and that each department shall act independently of and uninfluenced by the other—his opinions accord with my own and are those which have uniformly been promulgated as the great tenets of the Whig faith. His principles have been frankly avowed—they are Whig principles—and he has not only advocated them by pen and by speech, but at all times and under all circumstances he has cordially aided in the election of Whig men to carry them into practical effect. And, sir, though I look upon his brilliant military career, and his forty years of service to the nation on its battle-fields, as entitling him to the gratitude of his countrymen in its fullest extent, it is his unwavering devotion to the great principles of republicanism, and his able and efficient advocacy of human rights and popular government, that commend him most to my humble support.

Mr. Chairman, we may talk of legislative aid to American industry—to internal improvements—to your railroads, your rivers and harbors—we may dispute about the expediency of a distribution of the public lands, or the propriety of banks; we may agitate upon the question as to the details of a fugitive slave law; but, sir, these are all mere measures which, even the mighty people, in all their sovereignty, cannot control until they shall first establish the great Whig principle that

executive power shall not absorb the legislative powers of the Government. Sir, upon each and all of these measures all that I ask is free legislation, uncontrolled by Executive vetoes—uninfluenced by the President, either through fear, favor, or affection.

Mr. Chairman, it is the contest upon this ancient Whig principle now which creates the great division line between the political parties of this country—such a contest as in other days has dethroned monarchs and made rivers run red with blood. The jealousy of the Whig party of Executive power is justified by all human experience. It is founded upon the great republican principle that man is capable of self-government, and that the will of the people, constitutionally expressed, should be the law of the land. It was the source of that great struggle between the Whigs and Tories of England during the reign of Charles I., which brought the head of that monarch to the block. It displayed itself first here in the glorious struggle in our Colonies in the conflict between the same parties, during the reign of King George III.; the one party contending that the people should make the law, the other asserting the prerogatives of the Crown! Thanks to the God of battles, and ever-living gratitude to the patriotism and valor of our forefathers, it triumphed in America!

It was for the ascendancy of these principles that I, an humble soldier, enlisted under the banner of that Whig party when executive power and presidential usurpations struck down the sovereignty of the people!

Yielding to executive influences, the Secretary of the Interior may, if he chooses, forget his record, and, for a time, *punish* his “dependents” who may dare think for themselves, in opposition to Executive will.

The honorable gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. TOOMBS,] and his colleagues, may grow faint as the battle waxes warm, and fall by the way-side, or join the ranks of our opponents under the banner of

“The hero with never a scar!”—

My honorable friend from Tennessee, [Mr. GENTRY,] whose eloquence, in days gone by, cheered on many a gallant spirit in support of these great Whig truths, may grow weak and “go home,”

withdrawing from the conflict those brilliant talents which God gave him for the use of his country.

The voice of the honorable gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. CLINGMAN,] may be hushed by his desires to form a “balance-of-power party” in the State Legislature.

But let me say to each and to all of them, that that great cause will still be pressed forward and onward, with the spirit of our Whig ancestors, to a final and decisive triumph.

I have been told by our opponents that we might as well “surrender.” It is related, I believe by Headley, that the Emperor Napoleon was once, in the course of his life, struck with dismay at the sound of that word. It was near the close of one of his hardest-fought battles. The contest had been long—close—fearful. To turn the tide of battle, the “Imperial Guard” had been ordered into the action—those scarred veterans who knew no defeat, and whose personal devotion to their great captain had caused them to brave death, the “king of terrors,” in a thousand forms. An officer galloped from the field, strewn thick with the slain, to the Emperor, with the message, “the Old Guard have surrendered!” Napoleon’s countenance was the picture of dismay! After a moment’s pause, drawing himself up to his full height, he exclaimed: “Impossible, sir! impossible! The Old Guard know how to die, but not how to surrender!” So gentlemen will find it will be with the “Old Whig Guard,” who, under the banners on which their principles have been inscribed and borne aloft by such gallant leaders as Clay, Harrison, Taylor, and Scott, have battled through many a contest. There is no such word in their vocabulary as “Surrender.”

Let others do as they may, sir; for my own part, I have long been enlisted in this cause—a soldier not for three months, nor six months, nor “for the war” alone, but for life; and my greatest aim shall be so to press on, that when my battles are all over in this world, it may be written of me, politically, at least—

“Faithful found
Among the faithless.” * * * *
* * * * “Unmoved,
Unshaken, unseduced, unterrified,
His loyalty he kept, his love, his zeal;
Nor number, nor example, with him wrought
To swerve from truth, or change his constant mind!”

List of the Democratic Galphinizers who plundered the Public Treasury, with the amount of each one’s plunder, as appears from the official document.

Samuel Swartwout, New York.....	\$1,225,705 69
Wm. M. Price, do.....	75,000 00
A. S. Thurston, Key West, Florida.....	2,822 14
Geo. W. Owen, Mobile, Alabama.....	11,173 48
Israel P. Canby, Crawfordsville, Indiana.....	39,013 13
Abr’m McCarty, Indianapolis, Indiana.....	1,338 92
B. F. Edwards, Edwardsville, Illinois.....	2,315 76
W. L. D. Ewing, Vandalia, Illinois.....	16,754 29
John Hays, Jackson, Mississippi.....	1,386 16
Willis M. Green, Palmyra, Missouri.....	2,312 12
B. S. Chambers, Little Rock, Arkansas.....	1,146 28
David L. Tod, Opelousas, Louisiana.....	27,230 57
R. R. Rogers, Opelousas, Louisiana.....	6,624 37
Maurice Cannon, New Orleans.....	1,259 28
A. W. McDaniel, Washington, Mississippi.....	6,000 00
John H. Owens, St. Stephen, Alabama.....	30,611 97
W. P. Harris, Columbus.....	109,147 08
W. Taylor, Cahawba, Alabama.....	23,116 18
U. G. Mitchell, do.....	54,626 55

George B. Crutcher, Choctaw, Mississippi....	6,061 40
George B. Cameron do.....	39,059 64
S. W. Dickens, do.....	11,831 91
Same, do.....	898 53
J. W. Stephenson, Galena, Illinois.....	43,294 04
Littlebury Hawkins, Helena, Arkansas.....	100,000 00
S. W. Beall, Green Bay.....	10,620 19
Joseph Friend, Washita, Louisiana.....	2,541 91
Wm. H. Allen, St. Augustine.....	1,997 50
Gordon D. Boyd, Columbus, Mississippi.....	50,937 29
R. H. Stirling, Choctaw, Mississippi.....	10,733 70
Paris Childers, Greensburgh, Louisiana.....	12,449 76
Wm. Linn, Vandalia, Illinois.....	55,962 06
Samuel T. Scott, Jackson, Mississippi.....	12,550 47
James T. Pollock, Crawfordsville, Indiana....	14,891 98
John L. Daniels, Opelousas, Louisiana.....	7,280 63
Morgan Neville, Cincinnati, Ohio.....	13,781 19
M. J. Allen, Tallahassee, Florida.....	26,621 57
Robert Key Brown, Springfield, Missouri....	3,600 50

Total.....\$2,064,209 88